

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,012	12/10/2003	Christopher L. Coleman	10021079-1	7522
57299 7590 05/04/2007 AVAGO TECHNOLOGIES, LTD. P.O. BOX 1920			EXAMINER	
			CURS, NATHAN M	
DENVER, CO 80201-1920			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	2613	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1/
ĊΚ
70

## **Advisory Action**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/733,012	COLEMAN, CHRISTOPHER L.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Nathan Curs	2613	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief --The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 25 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below): (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_ 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) \( \) will not be entered, or b) \( \) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-6,8-15,17 and 18. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. 

The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Other: \_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to claims 1, 5, 13 and 15, the applicant argues that in the Green reference, fig. 10, element 37, fig. 6, element 71 and fig. 13 do not disclose collimating lenses. The applicant argues first that a collimating lens transforms a divergent or convergent beam into a parallel beam or vice verse, provides a definition of "collimation", and argues that fig. 10, element 37 is a beam expanding telescope not a collimating lens, that fig. 6, element 71 is a beam reducing telescope not a collimating lens, and that the only collimating lens in fig. 13 is element 191. However, fig. 10, element 37 has two lens shown in the drawing. Lens element 41 is a collimating lens; it transforms a divergent beam into a parallel beam. The fact that Green pairs lens element 41 with another lens (element 39) does not mean lens element 41 is suddenly not collimating. The same idea applies to fig. 6, element 71 and fig. 13 (element 37).

The applicant also provides a definition of a collimator and argues that element 37 (of fig. 10) is not near the focal point of the beam on which it acts, as it operates on a beam of light that is already parallel. However, within element 37, the beam of light between lens elements 39 and 41 is clearly not parallel, and lens element 41 is near the focal point on which it acts. How can the applicant even say what focal point "element 37" is acting on without considering the focal point of lens element 41? Further, the definition of a collimator provided by the applicant says there is a light source at the focal point of the collimating lens, but even if a collimator has a light source at the focal point of a collimating lens, the light source is not a characteristic of the collimating lens itself. The same ideas apply to fig. 6, element 71 and fig. 13 (element 37).

JASON CHAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600